Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for returning signed and initialed copies of the
Information Disclosure Statements (PTO 1449) filed November 26, 2003; June 10,
2003; November 14, 2002; February 21, 2002; and January 31, 2001, that were
included with the Office Action.

Claims 21-40 are pending in this application. Claims 21, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and
35- 40 are amended solely in an effort to expedite prosecution. No claims are canceled
or added. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendment and
the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is
requested.

Rejection Under Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Claims 21-40 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double
patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-20 and 1-18 of U.S. Patent
Nos. 6,064,977 and 6,301,621, respectively. Applicants will consider filing a Terminal
Disclaimer to overcome this rejection after the claims have been determined to
otherwise be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being

unpatentable over Higley, US Patent No. 5,790,793 (herein referred to as Higley)

in view of Sankar, US Patent No. 5,867,822 (herein referred to as Sankar).

Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 21 includes, among other things, the recitation of a server

that enables the user to select at least one non-markup language object from the

plurality of non-markup language objects, and based on the selection of the user,

- 10 -

Application Serial No.: 09/774,117
Attorney Docket No.:   042846-0312813
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111

translates the selected non-markup language object to at least one markup language object. Independent claims 27, 33, and 39 include, among other things, features similar to this one.

In an exemplary embodiment, a user may select a non- markup language object by designating, for example, the filename and/or unique identifier that corresponds to the non-markup language object (see the Specification at page 13, lines 4-9). Or, for example, representations of non-HTML objects may be embedded in an HTML document, and a user may select a desired non-HTML object by selecting a corresponding representation of the desired non-HTML object (see the Specification at page 30, lines 14-17). The user's selection may be relayed to a non-HTML server (see the Specification at page 31, lines 6-10). The non-HTML server may retrieve the desired non-HTML object, which may then be translated by an HTML translator (see the Specification at page 31, lines 11-13).

In contrast, Higley appears to be drawn to a system that creates or receives a document located on a network at a URL (see Higley at col. 5, lines 2-4). The document, including the URL, may be transmitted and received as electronic mail without user interaction (see Higley at col. 5, lines 19-26). In instances where the document is a text-type document (non-markup language object), the document is automatically converted into HTML format by a known mail-to-HTML converter. A user that receives e-mail may access the document located at the URL on the network (see Higley at col. 5, line 67-col. 6, line 2). Thus, Higley provides a system that automatically translates a text document located on a network at a URL to an email in HTML and enables a user that receives the email to access the document on the network. Higley

- 11 -

does not provide the user with a plurality of documents and therefore does not enable a user to select documents to convert. Higley is therefore deficient because it doesn't enable the user to *select at least one non-markup language object from the plurality of non-markup language objects*, and *based on the selection* of the user, translates the selected non-markup language object to at least one markup language object.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that Higley is deficient at least for failing to teach a non-markup language object comprising scheduling and calendaring information. The Examiner relies on Sankar for a teaching of scheduling and calendaring information in an enterprise system. Sankar appear to be drawn to an electronic calendar that uses allegedly new protocols and mechanisms (see Sankar at the Abstract). Even if the Examiner's allegation with respect to the teachings of Sankar is true, Sankar is silent regarding a server that enables the user to select at least one non-markup language object from the plurality of non-markup language objects, and based on the selection of the user, translates the selected non-markup language object to at least one markup language object.

Thus, Higley and Sankar, both alone and in combination, fail to teach all of the features of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regards to claims 21, 27, 33, and 39. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested. Claims 22-26, 28-32, 34-38, and 40 depend from and add additional features to independent claims 21, 27, 33, and 39. Therefore, claims 22-26, 28-32, 34-38, and 40 are allowable, at least, by virtue of their dependency.

- 12 -

Customer Number
00909

Application Serial No.: 09/774,117
Attorney Docket No.:   042846-0312813
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the

undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: November 12, 2004   Respectfully submitted,

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000

- 13 -

RES 109914v1

PAGE 14/14 * RCVD AT 11/12/2004 4:40:30 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/10 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:703 905 2500 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-38